

NEBRASKA CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT (CQI)



Child Protection & Safety

Our Vision: Children are safe and healthy and have strong, permanent connections to their families.

Our Commitments:

1. Children are our #1 priority
2. We respect and value parents and families
3. We value partnerships
4. We are child welfare professionals

TABLE OF CONTENTS


Chapter 1: Prevention and Early Intervention.....	9
Count of Wards 2012-2014.....	10
Current OOH Wards per 1,000 Population.....	13
Point In Time State Ward Count with State Ward Entries and Exits.....	15
3A No Fault Wards 2013 – 2014	16
3C Wards 2013 – 2014	17
Entry and Exit Quarterly Data.....	18
 Chapter 2: Safety.....	 21
Intake/Hotline Calls.....	22
Intake/Hotline Quality Measures.....	23
CPS Intakes accepted for assessment	24
Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence (COMPASS).....	25
Initial Assessments Not Finalized.....	26
Initial Assessments Contact Timeframes.....	27
Services to family to protect children in the home and prevent removal or re-entry (CFSR Item 2).....	29
Absence of Maltreatment in Foster Care (COMPASS)	30
Assessment of Placement Safety and Suitability (APSS)	31
SDM – Distribution of Youth in Care with Finalized SDM Assessment.....	33
 Chapter 3: Permanency	 35
Youth Placed Out of State.....	36
Supervisor Review – Once every 60 Days	38
Permanency Hearings Occurring for Children in Care 12+ Months.....	39
Court Reviews Occurring Every 6 Months.....	40
Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers (Systematic Factor #24).....	41
Termination of Parental Rights (Systemic Factor #23)	42
Documentation of Placement Changes within 72 Hours	43
Family Team Meeting Frequency – Once Every 90 Days	44
Family Team Meeting Quality Reviews.....	45
Case Plans Created within 60 Days of Youth Entering Custody.....	46
Case Plan Quality (Systemic Factor #20)	47
Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning (CFSR Item 13).....	48
Caseworker Visits with Parent (CFSR Item 15)	49
Caseworker Visit with Mother & Father (Monthly State Measure).....	50
Needs and Services for the Child, Parent and Foster Parent (CFSR Item 12).....	51
Contact with Child in Out of Home Care (Federal Measure)	52
Contact with State Wards and Child In Non Court Case (Monthly State Measure)	53
Caseworker Visit with Child (CFSR Item 14).....	54
Permanency of Children in Foster Care (COMPASS).....	55
Timeliness of Adoption (COMPASS).....	56
Timeliness of Reunification(COMPASS).....	57
Placement Stability (COMPASS).....	62
Kinship Care for Out of Home Wards.....	63
State wards In Home/Out of Home.....	64


TABLE OF CONTENTS Continued..

Chapter 4: Healthy Children	67
Youth Exiting to Emancipation.....	68
Educational Needs for the Child (CFSR Item 16).....	69
Physical Health of the Child (CFSR Item 17).....	70
Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child (CFSR Item 18)	71
 Chapter 5: Workforce Stability	 73
Vacancy Rate.....	74
Turnover Rate.....	76
 Chapters 6-9 : Service Array	 79
Coordination/Collaboration/Communication	
Financing and	
Indian Child Welfare	
 Chapter 10: Organizational Excellence/Continuous Quality Improvement	 81
Statewide CQI Meeting Schedule and Discussion Topics.....	82
Federal IM 12-07.....	83
Statewide CQI Process	84
Local CQI Process.....	85
Inter Rater Reliability Program	86
Information System (Systematic Factor #19).....	87

Nebraska Federal Indicators Matrix

August 2015

 Department of Health & Human Services NEBRASKA	Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence	Absence of Maltreatment in Foster Care	Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification	Timeliness of Adoption	Permanency for Children in Foster Care	Placement Stability
Federal Target:	94.60%	99.68%	122.6	106.4	121.7	101.5
Eastern	94.47%	99.76%	115.8	139.6	160.8	108.7
Southeast	95.67%	99.83%	118.9	142.5	134.4	109.4
Central	94.08%	100.00%	121.4	156.5	152.4	112.2
Northern	96.88%	99.87%	139.0	151.9	157.8	119.1
Western	95.73%	100.00%	129.3	153.3	179.4	119.4
State	95.27%	99.85%	119.6	145.2	154.3	111.1

 = Passing the Federal

 = Not Passing the Federal Indicator

Note: Youth throughout the state who are placed in YRTC are reflected in the Federal Measures for the Central and Southeast Service Areas due to the YRTC's being located in Kearney and Geneva.



Nebraska Federal Indicators Matrix

Division of Children and Family Services

	Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence					Absence of Maltreatment in Foster Care					Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification					Timeliness of Adoption					Permanency for Children in Foster Care					Placement Stability				
Federal Target:	94.60%					99.68%					122.6					106.4					127.7					101.5				
Dates	Mar-06	Jun-08	Jun-10	Jun-12	Jun-14	Mar-06	Jun-08	Jun-10	Jun-12	Jun-14	Mar-06	Jun-08	Jun-10	Jun-12	Jun-14	Mar-06	Jun-08	Jun-10	Jun-12	Jun-14	Mar-06	Jun-08	Jun-10	Jun-12	Jun-14	Mar-06	Jun-08	Jun-10	Jun-12	Jun-14
Eastern	92.8%	91.2%	91.4%	92.9%	97.03%	99.72%	99.68%	99.64%	99.62%	99.43%	118.4	110.0	115.4	111.9	114.85	76.1	101.6	107.3	100.4	131.49	141.4	141.6	146.3	152.2	150.61	88.1	88.9	91.6	97.7	103.24
Southeast	88.3%	91.7%	92.7%	88.5%	95.57%	99.75%	99.67%	99.73%	99.31%	99.94%	123.5	97.1	102.0	113.8	120.89	90.5	109.5	124.4	133.5	136.18	146.6	152.8	157.4	153.0	155.17	89.6	95.7	95.6	100.2	100.20
Central	92.2%	93.7%	95.5%	92.2%	94.94%	99.70%	99.58%	99.88%	99.88%	100.00%	125.1	102.5	118.1	122.5	113.53	80.1	131.6	102.2	148.5	118.62	158.2	151.9	138.8	177.0	166.72	83.8	88.3	90.7	95.2	102.36
Northern	90.3%	92.0%	93.9%	93.7%	95.93%	99.53%	99.74%	99.79%	97.95%	99.75%	115.0	125.3	126.5	126.2	124.11	94.8	112.4	138.4	119.0	132.27	145.6	156.9	155.8	169.5	158.13	87.6	83.6	89.4	93.2	111.13
Western	92.3%	95.0%	95.7%	91.7%	95.67%	99.73%	99.91%	99.78%	99.88%	99.67%	127.5	108.5	125.8	115.5	110.49	84.7	76.9	129.8	135.1	142.52	142.3	153.3	160.4	170.2	155.37	85.6	90.6	85.3	93.4	102.84
State	90.6%	92.1%	92.7%	91.4%	96.02%	99.70%	99.70%	99.72%	99.43%	99.70%	117.8	105.0	114.0	112.8	116.97	87.3	105.0	117.6	119.1	127.11	144.5	149.5	148.2	155.6	153.72	87.1	90.0	91.6	97.0	103.10


8/19/2014 Prepared by: A. Wilson

= Passing the Federal Indicator
 = Not Passing the Federal Indicator

* This chart was added to the CQI document in August 2014


Statewide: State Wards and Non-Court Involved Children by Race Per 1000 of the Population

Data as of 03/16/2015




Statewide: State Wards and Non-Court Involved Children by Race Per 1000 of the Population

Data as of 03/16/2015




Northern Service Area: State Wards and Non-Court Involved Children by Race Per 1000 of the Population

Data as of 03/16/2015




Northern Service Area: State Wards and Non-Court Involved Children by Race Per 1000 of the Population

Data as of 03/16/2015




Central Service Area: State Wards and Non-Court Involved Children
by Race Per 1000 of the Population

Data as of 03/16/2015




Eastern Service Area: State Wards and Non-Court Involved Children
by Race Per 1000 of the Population

Data as of 03/16/2015




Southeast Service Area: State Wards and Non-Court Involved
Children by Race Per 1000 of the Population

Data as of 03/16/2015



Western Service Area: State Wards and Non-Court Involved Children
by Race Per 1000 of the Population

Data as of 03/16/2015



INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHAPTER 1: PREVENTION AND EARLY INTERVENTION

OUTCOME STATEMENT: CHILDREN AND FAMILY WILL HAVE TIMELY ACCESS TO THE SERVICES AND SUPPORT THEY NEED.

Goal Statement: Build infrastructure to support at-risk families;

- Primary Prevention – Targeted to general population, aimed at educating the public about child abuse and neglect, with the goal of stopping abuse before it happens.
- Secondary Prevention – Targeted to individual or families in which maltreatment is more likely
- Tertiary Prevention – Targeted toward families in which abuse has already occurred

Safely Decrease the Number of State Wards

Strengths/Opportunities:

Sept 2015: Reduction of 1,459 wards since January 2013.

* We have seen a 35% decrease in state wards since 2012.



Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

* Statewide

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children and Families Will Have Timely Access to the Services and Support They Need



*LB 961 directs DHHS to realign the Western, Central, and Northern Service Areas to be coterminous with the District Court judicial districts. The baseline data from July 2, 2012 reflects this geographical change.

Data Review Frequency: Quarterly

Safely Decrease the Number of State Wards

Strengths/Opportunities:



Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

* Statewide

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children and Families Will Have Timely Access to the Services and Support They Need



*LB 961 directs DHHS to realign the Western, Central, and Northern Service Areas to be coterminous with the District Court judicial districts. The baseline data from July 2, 2012 reflects this geographical change.

Data Review Frequency: Quarterly

Safely Decrease the Number of State Wards

Strengths/Opportunities:



Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

* Statewide

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children and Families Will Have Timely Access to the Services and Support They Need



Data Review Frequency: Quarterly

*LB 961 directs DHHS to realign the Western, Central, and Northern Service Areas to be coterminous with the District Court judicial districts. The baseline data from July 2, 2012 reflects this geographical change.

Safely Decrease the Number of State Wards

Strengths/Opportunities:

NSA continues to have fewer wards per 1,000 than what is expected compared to the national average of 5.2/1,000.

Barriers:

Action Items:

**Completed:*


**Planned:*

CQI Team Priority:

* Statewide

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children and Families Will Have Timely Access to the Services and Support They Need



Out of Home Court wards using 2014 Claritas youth population < 19 yrs. of age.

Note: Count by County Report is now available.

Safely Decrease the Number of State Wards

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: Statewide increase to 6.7.

Note: Claritas Youth Population Details:

	2012	2014	Difference
Eastern	193,685	198,681	4,996
Southeast	105,316	105,840	524
Northern	88,434	84,503	(3,931)
Central	58,229	56,839	(1,390)
Western	50,896	48,775	(2,121)
State	496,560	494,638	(1,922)

Barriers:


Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

* Statewide

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children and Families Will Have Timely Access to the Services and Support They Need



-Prior to October 2014 -- Out of Home Court wards using 2012 Claritas youth population < 19 yrs. of age.

-Starting October 2014 -- Out of Home Court wards using 2014 Claritas youth population < 19 yrs. of age.

Note: Count by County Report is now available.

Safely Decrease the Number of State Wards

Strengths/Opportunities:

Lower number of exits than entries.
This quarter is the 1st quarter in over 2 years where the number of entries have exceeded the number of exits.

LB-561 became effective Oct 1, 2013. This resulted in youth being cared for by probation rather than CFS


Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

* Statewide

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children and Families Will Have Timely Access to the Services and Support They Need



Data Review Frequency: Quarterly

State Wards – 3A No Fault

Strengths/Opportunities:

Average change before Oct 2013 = 101.7

Average change after Oct 2013 = 131.8


Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

Data Review Frequency: Quarterly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children and Families Will Have Timely Access to the Services and Support They Need



State Wards – 3C Adjudications

Strengths/Opportunities:

Average change before Oct 2013 = 23.6

Average change after Oct 2013 = 41.3


Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

Data Review Frequency: Quarterly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children and Families Will Have Timely Access to the Services and Support They Need



Safely Decrease the Number of State Wards

Strengths/Opportunities:

Statewide: Entry numbers are currently higher than exit numbers.

NOTE: Starting April 2014 – The statewide numbers include counts for the YRTC.

Barriers:


Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

* Statewide

Data Review Frequency: Quarterly





OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children and Families Will Have Timely Access to the Services and Support They Need



N-Focus Legal Status field. An entry occurs when a child is made a state ward. An exit occurs when the Legal Status changes to non-ward - not when it is entered into NFocus. Entries include youth that go from non-court to court. Counts based on date of action, not entry date into NFocus

Safely Decrease the Number of State Wards

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children and Families Will Have Timely Access to the Services and Support They Need



INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHAPTER 2: SAFETY

OUTCOME STATEMENT: CHILDREN INVOLVED IN THE CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEM ARE SAFE

Goal Statement: CFS will have a timely response to reports of child abuse and neglect reports and conduct quality safety and risk assessments.

Intake Calls/Responses

Strengths/Opportunities:



Aug 2015: 93% of all calls to the hotline were answered within 18 seconds. 3% of the calls went to voicemail and were returned within 1 hour.

Barriers:

Action Items:

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



Definitions:

* Abandoned-call comes in and is not answered due to something in the ACD system which caused a reason for a disconnect or caller hung up.

* Forceout-call comes in and call was sent to worker and worker did not answer -(maybe due to...forgot to log off while faxing)

* Voicemail-calls unanswered that go to voicemail. The goal is to return the call within 1 hour. Case Aides track when the message came in and when the call is returned.

Intake Quality Measures

Strengths/Opportunities:

April 2015: 100% achievement in 3 out of the 4 measures. 99% in the remaining measure.


Barriers:

Action Items:

*** Hotline Phone Call Observation QA Reviews were implemented in August 2015. Data from the reviews will be available in October 2015.**

Data Review Frequency: Quarterly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



***Data from the next Intake/Hotline Quality reviews will be available in October 2015.**

CPS Intakes Accepted

Strengths/Opportunities:

*Eastern, Central, Northern and Southeast saw an increase in CPS Intakes accepted in 2015 compared to the same period of time (Jan-Aug) in 2014.



*ESA and NSA have seen stair step increases for the past 3 years.

*ESA saw the most increase between 2014 and 2015 (17%)

Barriers:

Action Items:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



Absence of Maltreatment in Six Months

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: **State performance is above the target goal.** ESA and CSA are currently not meeting this goal.

Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

*Statewide External Stakeholder Team


*Western and Southeast Service Areas

*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence - COMPASS Measures



This is Federal Measure that reports on a rolling 12 month period. Data Source: N-FOCUS COMPASS-State wards. The children included in this report were victims of abuse or neglect during the first six months of the 12 month period. If the child was a victim of a subsequent abuse or neglect incident within 6 months of the first incident of abuse or neglect they appear on this report. Victims are defined as children where the court or DHHS has substantiated the allegations of abuse or neglect.

Data Review Frequency: Quarterly (March, June, September, December)



IA – Investigation Timeframes

Strengths/Opportunities:

Sept 2015: CSA has the lowest number of IA's not finalized while Tribal has the highest number.

On 9/15/15 there were 872 Initial Assessments that were not finalized for the entire State for this same period. 42% of those belong to the Tribes.

Barriers:

- ESA & NSA: Staff Vacancies
- Tribes: Time to document assessments and increase knowledge and ability to document SDM Assessments on N-FOCUS.

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

- Western Service Area


*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



Initial Assessments- NOT FINALIZED (2012-2015)

* Initial Assessments that are not finalized past 30 days from the intake closure date.
as of September 15th, 2015



Statewide #s:

Jan = 1,042
Feb = 1,026
Mar = 1,129
Apr = 1,202
May = 1,243
June = 1,268
July = 912
Aug = 860
Sept = 872

*This chart illustrates cases that are not finalized due to one or more of the following reasons:
Safety assessment not tied to the intake, Risk assessment is not in final status, and/or Finding has not been entered.*



Data is part of CFSR Item #4 (Risk and Safety Management).

Data Review Frequency: Monthly



IA – Contact Timeframes

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: There was a decrease in P1 and P2 contact timeliness and an increase in P3. The most common reason for missed contacts is due to contact not being made in a timely manner or not documented.

Barriers:

Action Items:

* Program guidance and clarification will be sent to the field to address the requirement to contact ALL child victims within the required timeframe per designated intake response priority.

CQI Team Priority:

- Western Service Area


*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



Initial Assessment - Contacts made according to Priority Timeframes Statewide

*Data excludes Refusals, Unable to Locate, and Law Enforcement Holds



Count Missed by Admin

Omaha-Spears	4
Winnebago- Painter	1
SESA - Bro	16
SESA - Jelinek	1
ESA-Baker	15
ESA - Pitt	13
ESA - Potterf	3
ESA - Nawrocki	1
CSA - Zimmerman	5
NSA - Ullrich	9
NSA - Swerczek	1
WSA - Brooks	3
Total	72

Reason for Missed Contacts

Intake not tied to Assessment (No Assessment Found)	4
Contact Made After Report Ran	9
Contact Not Timely or Not Documented	30
Incorrect ARP Number	2
Assessment Not Completed	18
No exception documented for LE Hold	1
Contact made before intake receive date	2
Request to screen out pending	1
Rescreen to DNMD after report ran	1
Unable to Locate after report ran	1
No Identified Victim/No Contact with Victim	3
Total	72

Note: Intakes accepted for APSS or OH investigations were included in this measure for the first time in November 2013.



Data is part of CFSR Item #1 (Timeliness of Initiating Investigations)

Data Review Frequency: Monthly



IA – Contact Timeframes




Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: NSA achieved 100% for P1 this month.

Barriers:

Action Items:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



Data Review Frequency: Monthly



Data is part of CFSR Item #1 (Timeliness of Initiating Investigations)

Services to Family to Protect Children – CFSR Item 2

Strengths/Opportunities:


- Good documentation of efforts to maintain the children in the home.

Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



Data Review Frequency: Bi-Monthly

Absence of Maltreatment in Foster Care

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: All Service Areas are currently meeting this goal. Statewide performance is 99.85%.


Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

*Statewide External Stakeholder Team

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



Data Review Frequency: Quarterly (March, June, September, December)

APSS Data

Strengths/Opportunities:

Sept-July 2015: An APSS was completed on 97% of the accepted intakes requiring an APSS.

An APSS was completed on 64% of the non-accepted intakes with concerns related to the child's foster home.


Barriers:

Action Items:

****Casey Smith and Stacy Scholten are working on draft recommendations for changes to APSS process.**

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



The SDM Assessment of Placement Safety and Suitability (APSS) is a tool that is used to assess safety and care concerns for children placed in approved and licensed foster homes. When the intake on the foster home is accepted, the APSS is completed by an IA CFS Specialist, when it is not accepted (e.g. does not meet definition), it is completed by the ongoing CFS Specialist (in ESA, the FPS). *Assessments do not need to be in final status.*



Data is part of CFSR Item #4 (Risk and Safety Management).



APSS Data

Strengths/Opportunities:

Sept 2015: There were 356 APSS finalized statewide. 24% had a determination of conditionally suitable or unsuitable.


Barriers:

Action Items:

****Casey Smith and Stacy Scholten are working on draft recommendations for changes to APSS process.**

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



The SDM Assessment of Placement Safety and Suitability (APSS) is a tool that is used to assess safety and care concerns for children placed in approved and licensed foster homes. When the intake on the foster home is accepted, the APSS is completed by an IA CFS Specialist, when it is not accepted (e.g. does not meet definition), it is completed by the ongoing CFS Specialist (in ESA, the FPS).

Definitions:

Suitable – Based on the information available (at this time), there are no child concerns in this placement.

Conditionally Suitable – Based on interventions, the child will remain in the household at this time. An intervention plan is required.

Unsuitable – Removal from the household is the only protective intervention possible for one or more children. Without removal, one or more children will likely be in danger of serious harm or in an unsuitable care arrangement



Data is part of CFSR Item #4 (Risk and Safety Management).



SDM Risk Re & Reunification Assessments

Strengths/Opportunities:

of All Youth with No Finalized Risk-Re or Reunification Assessments

	July	Aug	Sept
State	58	77	80
CSA	3	4	5
ESA	24	30	32
NSA	11	18	22
SESA	4	10	3
WSA	16	15	18

Barriers:

Action Items:

* Policy team to provide clarification regarding SDM assessments needed for 3C cases. The Safety Assessment and FSNA is the only SDM Assessments that apply to 3C Cases.



CQI Team Priority:

* Western Service Area

*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



Note: Data includes youth in ALL adjudication types



Data is part of CFSR Item #4 (Risk and Safety Management).



SDM Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (FSNA)

Strengths/Opportunities:

# of ALL Youth with No Finalized FSNA			
	July	Aug	Sept
State	18	59	28
CSA	0	28	1
ESA	6	9	12
NSA	0	2	7
SESA	4	13	2
WSA	8	7	6

Barriers:

Action Items:



- * Policy team provided additional direction for initial FSNA timeframes.
- * Policy team to provide clarification regarding SDM assessments needed for 3C cases. The Safety Assessment and FSNA is the only SDM Assessments that apply to 3C Cases.

CQI Team Priority:

- * Western Service Areas

*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Involved in the Child Protection System are Safe



Note: Data includes youth in ALL adjudication types

Data Review Frequency: Monthly



Data is part of CFSR Item #4 (Risk and Safety Management).

CHAPTER 3: PERMANENCY

**OUTCOME STATEMENT: CHILDREN WILL ACHIEVE
TIMELY PERMANENCY (Reunification, Guardianship,
Adoption and Independent Living)**

**Goal Statement: Front End – Children will remain home whenever
safely possible. Children in out-of-home care will achieve timely
permanency**

Youth Placed Out of State

Strengths/Opportunities:

Sept 2015: On Sept 17th, 2015 – there were 147 youth placed outside of Nebraska.

- 27% - 40 of these youth are placed in congregate care.
- 57% - 84 of these youth are placed in neighboring states (IA, KS, CO, MO and SD).

Total Number of Youth Out of State:

Sept 2014 = 144

Oct 2014 = 146

Nov 2014 = 142

Jan 2015 = 133

Feb 2015 = 143

Mar 2015 = 157

Apr 2015 = 150

May 2015 = 148

June 2015 = 148

July 2015 = 153

Aug 2015 = 144


Sept 2015 = 147

Barriers:

*Refer to Local Service Area or Tribal Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Area/Tribe.

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



*Includes all youth and all placements out of Nebraska (parent/congregate/foster). Excluding Tribal Youth.

Youth Placed Out of State

Strengths/Opportunities:

Sept 2015:

- 60% or 24 out of 40 of the youth placed in congregate care are placed in the following neighboring states – IA, KS, CO, MO, and SD. At times, placement in these bordering states is in closer proximity to the youth's parents.
- 2 youth have been placed in congregate care for 2 or more years.
- 53% or 21 out of 40 of the youth in congregate care have been in out of state placement for over 180 days (6 months or more).

Barriers:


Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

*Refer to Local Service Area or Tribal Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Area/Tribe.

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



*Includes all youth and all placements out of Nebraska (parent/congregate/foster). Excluding Tribal Youth.



CFS Supervisor Periodic Review

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015:

*Statewide = 83.0%

*Highest Performance = SESA (97.1%)

*Lowest Performance = Tribes (2.0%)

Barriers:


Action Items:

*KaCee Zimmerman will lead a workgroup to review expectations for supervisory and period reviews. Workgroup will make recommendations to the statewide CQI team.

CQI Team Priority:

*Refer to Local Service Area or Tribal Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Area/Tribe.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data Review Frequency: Monthly



Data for Systemic Factor #21 (Periodic Review). Data added to CQI document on 8/2014

Permanency Hearings

Strengths/Opportunities:

- Permanency Hearings Occurring in 84% of the cases reviewed by the FCRO for children in care 12+ months. This number is an increase from 82% in the previous 6 month review period.

Barriers:

Action Items:


CQI Team Priority:

Data Review Frequency: January and July

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Permanency Hearings Occurring for Children in Care 12+ Months Jan - June 2015 FCRO Reviews



A Permanency Hearing will occur for every child in OOH care for 12 or more months. The data represents the cases reviewed by the Foster Care Review Office (FCRO) from January - June 2015.



Data for Systemic Factor #21 (Periodic Reviews). Data added to CQI document on 8/2014

Permanency Hearings

Strengths/Opportunities:

- Court Reviews Occurring every 6 months in 93% of the cases reviewed by FCRO. This number is a decrease from 95% in the previous 6 month review period.


Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

Data Review Frequency: January and July

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data for Systemic Factor #22 (Permanency Hearings). Data added to CQI document on 8/2014

Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers

Strengths/Opportunities:

- **67%** of foster parents indicated that they often or always received notices for court review hearings regarding their foster child(ren).
- **56%** of foster parents indicated that they actively participated in the court review hearings regarding their foster child(ren).


Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



I received notices for court review hearings regarding my foster child(ren)						
Response	State	CSA	ESA	NSA	SESA	WSA
Never	34	3	14	4	12	1
Rarely	21	4	7	2	6	2
Sometimes	50	6	19	2	20	3
Often	37	1	16	7	9	4
Always	197	27	65	29	61	15
Not Applicable	12	3	1	2	4	2
Don't Know	1	0	1	0	0	0
Refused	1	0	1	0	0	0
Total	353	44	124	46	112	27

I actively participated in the court review hearings regarding my foster child(ren)						
Response	State	CSA	ESA	NSA	SESA	WSA
Never	62	7	25	7	16	7
Rarely	16	2	6	1	5	2
Sometimes	42	7	15	5	14	1
Often	33	4	13	4	9	3
Always	164	20	46	27	57	14
Not Applicable	33	3	17	2	11	0
Don't Know	1	0	1	0	0	0
Refused	2	1	1	0	0	0
Total	353	44	124	46	112	27

Data for Systemic Factor #24 (Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers).

Termination of Parental Rights

Strengths/Opportunities:

The FCRO was unable to determine if an exception hearing occurred in 83% of the cases reviewed.


Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



(Are TPR Proceedings occur in accordance with required provisions?)

Additional TRP data will come from the new N-FOCUS Parental Rights Documentation Fields and will be available in October 2015



Data for Systemic Factor #23 (Termination of Parental Rights). Data added to CQI document on date to be determined.

Placement Change Documentation w/in 72 hours

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: Increase in statewide performance (89.5%).

State performance was at 56% in May 2012.

Barriers:

Action Items:


CQI Team Priority:

*Northern Service Area

*Tribes

*Refer to Local Service Area or Tribal Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Area/Tribe.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data Review Frequency: Monthly

Family Team Meeting Frequency

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: State performance decreased to 92.0%. **YRTC has the highest score at 98.8%.** Tribes have the lowest score at 21.7%.

Note: The State performance was at 76.2% in May 2012.

Barriers:

-Lack of documentation in tribal cases.

Action Items:


CQI Team Priority:

*Northern Service Area

*Tribes

*Refer to Local Service Area or Tribal Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Area/Tribe.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data Review Frequency: Monthly



Family Team Meeting Quality

Strengths/Opportunities:

Mar 2014: The three areas needing the most improvement are:

1. Father Involvement: 8.2%
2. Informal Support Involvement: 9.4%
3. Child Involvement: 30.8%

Notes:

- The frequency and content of the QA reviews will be adjusted to meet the needs following the implementation of the new FTM Quality Policies and Training Guides.

Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

*Eastern and Western Service Areas

*Tribes


*Refer to Local Service Area or Tribal Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Area/Tribe.

Data Review Frequency: Quarterly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Statewide - FTM Quality Documentation Reviews



Number of FTM reviews by month: July 2014: 92, August 2014: 100, September 2014: 100, December 2014: 110, March 2015: 117.

This review looks at documentation of Family Team Meetings for an identified child to determine if:

- Key **team members** are actively involved in at least **50%** of the Family Team Meeting's held within a 6 month review period.

- Key **topic areas**: At least ***one** of the identified key topic area was discussed in at least **50%** of the Family Team Meetings held within a 6 month review period.

*Key **topic areas include**: Safety, Risk, Permanency/Concurrent Planning, Parenting Concerns/Child Behavior Concerns, Case Plan Development/Progress, Visitation, and Well-Being

This review began in July 2014.

Note: Documentation of **Key Topics** and **Next Steps** were not reviewed as part of the March 2015 review.

- FTM QA resumed after the implementation of the new FTM Guide in June 2015. Data from the reviews will be available October 2015.



Data is part of CFSR Item #18 (Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning).

Case Plans Created within 60 Days

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: 82.6% of the Case plans are created within 60 days of the youth entering into custody.

YRTC has the highest number of case plans created in 60 days (94.4%) and WSA has the lowest (56.0%).


Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data is part of CFSR Item #7 (Permanency Goal for the Child). Data added to CQI document on 6/2014

Case Plan Quality

Strengths/Opportunities:

Data indicates need for improvement in efforts to complete the most recent finalized case plan jointly with the child's father.

Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

*Refer to Local Service Area or Tribal Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Area/Tribe.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency




Systemic Factor #20: Case Review System

How well is the case review system functioning to ensure that each child has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the child and the child's parents and includes the required provisions?

■ PUR: Jan 2014 - Jan 2015
■ PUR: Mar 2014 - Mar 2015
■ PUR: Jun 2014 - Jun 2015

Target = 95%



Source of Data: N-FOCUS documentation and interview with the case manager.

PUR Jan 2014-Jan 2015: Reviewers were able to speak to the current case manager for 95% or 236 out of 249 of the cases that were reviewed.

PUR Mar 2014 - Mar 2015: Reviewers were able to speak to the current case manager for 95% or 196 out of 208 of the cases that were reviewed.

PUR Jun 2014 - Jun 2015: Reviewers were able to speak to the current case manager for 93% or 196 out of 210 of the cases that were reviewed.

Data Review Frequency Every 2 Months



Data for Systemic Factor - Item #20 (Case Review System).

Case Planning Involvement – CFSR 13

Strengths/Opportunities:

Note: The CFSR review results are based on a review of N-FOCUS documentation and information obtained during phone interviews with the CFSS or FPS.


Barriers:

- Lack of ongoing efforts to locate and/or engage non-custodial parent in case planning (in most cases, this is the child's father).
- Lack of ongoing efforts engage developmentally appropriate children in case planning.
- Lack of good quality documentation during family team meetings and face to face contacts between the worker, children, mother and father. Documentation should clearly state how the parent or youth was engaged in the creation of, ongoing evaluation and discussions regarding progress and needs related to case plan goals.

Action Items:

- Policy team will review and expand non-custodial parent memo to include instructions for engaging the non custodial parent. N-FOCUS changes are planned for July 2015.
- CFSR Champion – Monica Dement & SESA; see CFSR Binder for additional Action Items.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Caseworker Contact with Parent CFSR 15

Strengths/Opportunities:

Note: The CFSR review results are based on a review of N-FOCUS documentation and information obtained during phone interviews with the CFSS or FPS.

Barriers:

- Lack of ongoing efforts to visit with the child's non custodial parent (in most cases, this is the child's father).
- Lack of good quality documentation during face to face contacts between the worker and the child's mother and father.

Action Items:


- Policy team will update procedures memo to include clarification regarding parent contact when the child's permanency goal is something other than reunification or family preservation.
- *CFSR Champion – Lynn Castrianno & ESA; see CFSR Binder for additional Action Items.*

*CQI Team Priority:

Central Service Area

**Refer to Local Service Area or Tribal Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Area/Tribe.*

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data Review Frequency: Bi-Monthly



Worker Contact with Mother and Father

Strengths/Opportunities:

Statewide-Aug 2015:

Increase in contact with mothers to 70.1%.
Decrease in contact with fathers to 39.4%.

** Note: The performance accountability report was modified to require a contact for all parents whose rights are still intact regardless of the child's permanency goal. Prior to this, the report did not require a parent contact for all youth whose permanency goals were adoption, guardianship or independent living.*



Barriers:

* Identification and engagement of non-custodial parents, especially fathers.

Action Items:

- Lindy Bryceson, Legal and Policy Team will provide additional guidance to staff to assist with efforts to locate and engage the non-custodial parent, especially when working with a mother who does not want to involve the child's father in non court cases.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



*Note: Data includes parent contact in both court & non-court involved cases.



Data is part of CFSR Item #20 (Caseworker visit with mother/father). Data added to CQI document on 6/2014

Child, Parent & Foster Parent Needs Assessment – CFSR 12

Strengths/Opportunities:


Note: The CFSR review results are based on a review of N-FOCUS documentation and information obtained during phone interviews with the CFSS or FPS.

Barriers:

- Lack of good quality documentation during face to face contacts between the worker and the child. Documentation should contain sufficient information to address safety, permanency and well-being.

Action Items:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency





Federal Visitation with State Wards

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: New Fed Fiscal Year began in October 2013. The Federal Measure is 90%, this will increase to 95% in 2015. NE has set goal at 95% in preparation for the change with the federal measure. **State performance remained at 94.8% this month. Performance is 97% and above for all Service Areas, 85.7% for YRTC, and 30.3% for Tribal Cases.**

Note: In SFY11, NE reported 48.4% monthly child contact with this federal measure! WOW!!!

Barriers:

-Lack of documentation in tribal cases

Action Items:


CQI Team Priority:

*Tribes

**Refer to Local Service Area or Tribal Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Area/Tribe.*

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Case manager will have monthly face to face contact with the child. This federal visitation requirement is a cumulative measure for the federal fiscal year (October to December). Youth are required to be visited 95% of the months they are in out of home care. Data includes OJS Wards. (Data Source: Federal Visitation Data - NFOCUS/InfoView Reports). Starting Aug 2014 – data includes court youth placed at home on trial home visit.



Data is part of CFSR Item #19 (Caseworker visit with the child).



Monthly Contact with State Wards and Non-Court Involved Child

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: Non Court Case - statewide performance decreased to 85.1%.

Note: In May 2012, the state performance was at 53.4% for this measure.

Aug 2015: State Wards – statewide increase to 93.9%. WSA had the highest percentage at 98.8%. YRTC saw a decrease to 87.4% and tribal cases saw an increase to 24.9% this month.

Barriers:

-Lack of documentation in tribal cases



Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Case manager will have monthly face to face contact with the child (Data Source: CWS & OJS Performance Accountability Data - NFOCUS/InfoView Reports).

Data is part of CFSR Item #19 (Caseworker visit with the child).

Caseworker Contact with Child CFSR 14

Strengths/Opportunities:

Note: The CFSR review results are based on a review of N-FOCUS documentation and information obtained during phone interviews with the CFSS or FPS.

Barriers:

- Lack of good quality documentation during face to face contacts between the worker and the child's mother and father. Documentation should contain sufficient information to address safety, permanency and well-being.

Action Items:

** CFSR Champion – KaCee Zimmerman & CSA; see CFSR Binder for additional Action Items.*

CQI Team Priority:


*Central Service Area

**Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.*

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



CFSR Item 14 Caseworker Visits with Child



Item 14 on the CFSR looks at both the frequency and quality of the caseworker visits with the children in the case. This item looks at whether or not the frequency and quality of visits between the caseworker and the children in the case were sufficient to ensure safety, permanency, and well being of the child and promote achievement of case goals. Children should be seen privately when age appropriate and at least monthly in order for this item to be counted as a strength.

*Tribal data is based on cases reviewed from the Omaha Tribe, Santee Sioux Nation, and Winnebago Tribe. CFSR reviews of Tribal cases began with the July 2014 review.

The round 3 CFSR tool was implemented statewide in February 2015 for the period under review of January 2014 to January 2015. **Item 14 in the Round 3 CFSR tool is comparable to Item 19 in the previous CFSR tool.

Permanency for Children in Foster Care


Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: All Service Areas continue to meet the target goal for this measure.

Barriers:

Action Items:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data Review Frequency: Quarterly (March, June, September, December)

Timeliness of Adoption

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: All service areas continue to meet the target goal for this measure.

Barriers:

Action Items:


* Neligh/Legal will lead a sub committee to address legal barriers to TPR, Exceptions, Concurrent Planning and other barriers.

* 15 out of 22 Report/List has been updated and will be distributed to the court, County Attorney and Service Area Administrators on a regular basis.

CQI Team Priority:

*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Timeliness & Permanency of Reunification

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: NSA and WSA are currently meeting this measure.

Barriers:

Action Items:

* Policy team is in the process of drafting a new memo addressing diligent effort requirements and expectations for engaging parents.


CQI Team Priority:

*Statewide External Stakeholder Team

*Eastern, Northern, Southeast and Western Service Areas

*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data Review Frequency: Quarterly (March, June, September, December)

Timeliness & Permanency of Reunification

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: 66.4% of the exits to reunification happen between 0-12 months.

Barriers:

Action Items:


CQI Team Priority:

*Statewide External Stakeholder Team

*Eastern, Northern, Southeast and Western Service Areas

*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data Review Frequency: Quarterly (March, June, September, December)

Timeliness & Permanency of Reunification

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: No Service Area is currently meeting this measure. Statewide performance is at 35.7%.

Barriers:

Action Items:


CQI Team Priority:

*Statewide External Stakeholder Team

*Eastern, Northern, Southeast and Western Service Areas

*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data Review Frequency: Quarterly (March, June, September, December)

Timeliness & Permanency of Reunification

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: Statewide Median Months in care is 8.2. NSA (6.8) is closest to the target goal.

Barriers:

Action Items:


CQI Team Priority:

*Statewide External Stakeholder Team

*Eastern, Northern, Southeast and Western Service Areas

*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data Review Frequency: Quarterly (March, June, September, December)

Timeliness & Permanency of Reunification

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: CSA is not meeting the target goal for this measure.

Barriers:

Action Items:


CQI Team Priority:

*Statewide External Stakeholder Team

*Eastern, Northern, Southeast and Western Service Areas

*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data Review Frequency: Quarterly (March, June, September, December)

Placement Stability

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: State performance continues to exceed target goal this month. All Service Areas are meeting the target goal.

Barriers:

- Placement disruptions due to child behaviors
- Shortage of foster placements for older youth with behavior needs.


Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

- *Statewide External Stakeholder Team
- *Eastern, Southeast, Central and Western Service Areas.

*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data Review Frequency: Quarterly (March, June, September, December)

Kinship Care for Out of Home Wards

Strengths/Opportunities:

June 2015: WSA has the highest percentage of wards placed in kinship care (68.0%). SESA has the lowest number of wards in kinship care (48.9%).

Barriers:


Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

*Central and Southeast Service Areas

*Refer to Local Service Area Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Service Area.

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Per LB 265 (July 2013) a "kinship home means a home where a child or children receive foster care and at least one of the primary caretakers has previously lived with or is a trusted adult that has a pre-existing, significant relationship with the child or children or a sibling of such a child or children...."

Safely Decrease the Number of OOH Wards by Moving Them Back to In-Home Care

Strengths/Opportunities:

Sept 2015: Increase for wards In Home while seeing a decrease in wards in Out of Home Care.


Barriers:

Action Items:

CQI Team Priority:

* Statewide

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Data Review Frequency: Quarterly

Point in time report July 2014 OOH court wards using 2012 Claritas youth population < 19

Safely Decrease the Number of OOH Wards by Moving Them Back to In-Home Care

Strengths/Opportunities:

Apr 2015: ESA has the highest proportion of Out of home wards to in-home wards at 83.1%. CSA has the lowest proportion at 70.6%.

Barriers:

Action Items:


CQI Team Priority:

* Statewide

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Achieve Timely Permanency



Proportion of Out of Home to In-Home Wards by Service Area



INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHAPTER 4: HEALTHY CHILDREN

OUTCOME STATEMENT: CHILDREN WILL DEMONSTRATE POSITIVE WELL-BEING OUTCOMES

Goal Statement: Children will demonstrate improvements in Physical Health, Behavior Health and in Educational domains

AFCARS Youth Exiting to Emancipation

Strengths/Opportunities:

FY 2013:

-Overall decrease in the number of wards exiting to emancipation since Federal Fiscal Year 2012 (Decrease of 58 youth).

Barriers:

Action Items:

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Demonstrate Positive Well-Being Outcomes

3.4 Exits to Emancipation (%)

Nebraska: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Children Age 12 or Younger at Entry	11.8	12.2	11	11.5	8.9
Children Older Than 12 at Entry	88.2	87.8	89	88.5	91.1
Missing Data	0	0	0	0	0
Number	330	304	301	304	246

Emancipation (AFCARS N-FOCUS Definition): Youth who exited out of home care and DHHS custody due to one of the following reasons: "Independent Living Achieved", "Reached the Age of Majority", "Marriage" or "Joined the Military".

Needs and Services for the Child (Educational Needs – CFSR Item 16)

Strengths/Opportunities:


Note: The CFSR review results are based on a review of N-FOCUS documentation and information obtained during phone interviews with the CFSS or FPS.

Barriers:

- Lack of documentation of efforts address child's poor performance in school.

Action Items:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Demonstrate Positive Well-Being Outcomes



Needs and Services for the Child (Physical Health Needs – CFSR Item 17)

Strengths/Opportunities:


Note: The CFSR review results are based on a review of N-FOCUS documentation and information obtained during phone interviews with the CFSS or FPS.

Barriers:

- Out of home Cases: Lack of documentation of a physical or dental exam and/or results from the exam during the PUR.
- In home Cases: Lack of documentation of assessment of physical health for cases that opened in the PUR due to concerns of physical abuse or medical neglect.

Action Items:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Demonstrate Positive Well-Being Outcomes



Item 17 on the CFSR looks at the physical needs and services for the child. This item looks at whether or not the agency sufficiently assessed the physical health of the child (when applicable) and if the agency made efforts to ensure the appropriate services were provided to the child to meet any identified physical health needs.

*Tribal data is based on cases reviewed from the Omaha Tribe, Santee Sioux Nation, and Winnebago Tribe. CFSR reviews of Tribal cases began with the July 2014 review.

The round 3 CFSR tool was implemented statewide in February 2015 for the period of January 2014 to January 2015. **Item 17 in the Round 3 CFSR tool is comparable to Item 22 in the previous CFSR tool.

Needs and Services for the Child (Mental/Behavioral Health Needs – CFSR Item 23)

Strengths/Opportunities:


Note: The CFSR review results are based on a review of N-FOCUS documentation and information obtained during phone interviews with the CFSS or FPS.

Barriers:

- Out of home Cases: Lack of documentation to support ongoing assessment of child's mental health needs upon return to the parent's home.

Action Items:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: Children Will Demonstrate Positive Well-Being Outcomes



Item 18 on the CFSR looks at the mental/behavioral health and services for the child. This item looks at whether or not the agency sufficiently assessed the mental/behavioral health of the child (when applicable) and if the agency made efforts to ensure the appropriate services were provided to the child to meet any identified mental/behavioral health needs.

*Tribal data is based on cases reviewed from the Omaha Tribe, Santee Sioux Nation, and Winnebago Tribe. CFSR reviews of Tribal cases began with the July 2014 review.

The round 3 CFSR tool was implemented statewide in February 2015 for the period of January 2014 to January 2015. **Item 18 in the Round 3 CFSR tool is comparable to Item 23 in the previous CFSR tool.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHAPTER 5: WORKFORCE STABILITY

OUTCOME STATEMENT: THE DIVISION OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES' WORKFORCE IS WELL-QUALIFIED, TRAINED, SUPERVISED AND SUPPORTED

Goal Statement: Build and support a stable workforce to promote positive outcomes for children and families

CFS Staff Vacancy Rate

Strengths/Opportunities:

Sept 2015: CFS vacancy rate decreased to 3.8%

Barriers:

Action Items:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: The Division of Children and Family Services' Workforce is well-qualified, trained, Supervised and Supported

CFSS + CFSS/T													
Location	Sep-14	Oct-14	Nov-14	Dec-14	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15	Aug-15	Sep-15
CSA	1.8%	7.3%	7.3%	0.0%	5.5%	10.9%	5.6%	7.4%	9.3%	7.4%	9.3%	3.7%	0.0%
ESA	10.0%	11.1%	10.2%	8.7%	7.2%	14.3%	9.1%	7.8%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	2.6%
NSA	15.5%	16.9%	19.1%	14.7%	13.2%	17.6%	10.3%	4.4%	10.3%	13.2%	11.8%	10.3%	7.4%
SESA	3.2%	3.5%	1.9%	0.9%	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%	4.9%	8.7%	5.9%	4.8%	5.9%	6.7%
WSA	1.9%	11.1%	5.6%	3.7%	9.3%	11.1%	11.1%	7.5%	5.7%	7.5%	15.1%	5.7%	1.9%
Total	6.7%	9.5%	8.4%	5.4%	6.7%	9.8%	6.5%	5.6%	6.9%	6.1%	6.5%	5.1%	3.8%
YSS I													
Location	Sep-14	Oct-14	Nov-14	Dec-14	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15	Aug-15	Sep-15
YRTC Geneva	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	20.0%	20.0%	22.2%	22.2%
YRTC Kearney	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%
Total	8.3%	12.5%	12.5%	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%	12.5%	12.5%	16.7%	12.5%	13.0%	13.0%
YSS II													
Location	Sep-14	Oct-14	Nov-14	Dec-14	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15	Aug-15	Sep-15
YRTC Geneva	16.7%	23.3%	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%	23.3%	26.7%	26.7%	30.0%	30.0%	26.7%	12.5%	4.2%
YRTC Kearney	10.9%	8.9%	8.9%	11.1%	8.9%	6.7%	8.9%	13.3%	8.9%	15.9%	13.6%	18.2%	15.9%
Total	13.2%	14.7%	17.3%	18.7%	17.3%	13.3%	16.0%	18.7%	17.3%	21.6%	18.9%	16.2%	11.8%

*Date is effective as of first day of posted month

Data Review Frequency: Quarterly

Vacancies are allocated positions not filled, excluding frozen positions

NFC Staff Vacancy Rate

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: NFC Vacancy Rate increased to 18.60%

Barriers:

Action Items:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: The Division of Children and Family Services' Workforce is well-qualified, trained, Supervised and Supported

VACANCY RATES

	Apr15			May15			Jun15			Jul15*			Aug15		
Location	Vacant Positions	Total Positions	Vacancy Rate	Vacant Positions	Total Positions	Vacancy Rate	Vacant Positions	Total Positions	Vacancy Rate	Vacant Positions	Total Positions	Vacancy Rate	Vacant Positions	Total Positions	Vacancy Rate
NFC	24***	168	14.28%	27***	168	16.07%	35***	168	20.83%	29***	172	16.86%	32***	172	18.60%

Total Positions includes Family Permanency Supervisors and Family Permanency Specialists (based on 146 fully trained Family Permanency Specialists and 26 Family Permanency Supervisors)

***This does not include the Family Permanency Specialist Trainees

*NFC added 4 Family Permanency Supervisor positions in July 2015

CFS Staff Turnover

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: Decrease in turnover for CFS Spec Trainee and CFS Specialists.
Increase in turnover for CFS Supervisors.

Barriers:

Action Items:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: The Division of Children and Family Services' Workforce is well-qualified, trained, Supervised and Supported

Protection and Safety Turnover Percent*

Title	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	July 2015	Aug 2015
CFS Spec Trainee	3.54%	1.98%	5.48%	5.56%	8.57%	2.56%	2.00%	9.43%	2.13%	1.69%	5.66%	6.35%	4.11%
CFS Specialist	2.20%	2.74%	3.29%	1.01%	2.42%	2.49%	1.42%	1.07%	2.66%	3.68%	2.18%	1.85%	1.12%
CFS Supervisors	1.52%	1.47%	3.03%	0.00%	1.64%	0.00%	1.54%	3.17%	0.00%	0.00%	3.13%	0.00%	1.54%

Turnover Percent

Aug 2015

Title	CSA PS	ESA PS	NSA PS	SESA PS	WSA PS
CFS Spec Trainee	0.00%	6.25%	6.67%	0.00%	8.33%
CFS Specialist	0.00%	1.69%	2.08%	1.27%	0.00%
CFS Supervisors	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Turnover Counts

Aug 2015

Title	CSA PS	ESA PS	NSA PS	SESA PS	WSA PS
CFS Spec Trainee	0	0	1	0	1
CFS Specialist	0	0	1	1	0
CFS Supervisors	1	0	0	0	0

Aggregate Counts

Title	Total Employee	Term Employee	Turnover
CFS Spec Trainee	73	3	4.11%
CFS Specialist	269	3	1.12%
CFS Supervisors	62	1	1.54%

*Note: Turnover rates are calculated using filled positions at the end of the month and includes only those employees who left DHHS employment during that month. It does not include employees who transferred from one program or Division to another within DHHS. Turnover is as of the last day of posted month.

NFC Staff Turnover

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: Decrease in turnover for FPS.

Barriers:

Action Items:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: The Division of Children and Family Services' Workforce is well-qualified, trained, Supervised and Supported

STATE CQI TURNOVER, AGGREGATE COUNTS & VACANCY RATES

August 2015

NEBRASKA FAMILIES COLLABORATIVE TURNOVER PERCENT*											
Title	Sep-14	Oct-14	Nov-14	Dec-14	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Aug-15
FPS Trainee	10%	0%	0%	25%	9.09%	7.14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.34%
FPS	2.81%	3.57%	3.73%	6.20%	1.56%	1.58%	4.72%	4.09%	5.83%	7.07%	1.75%
FP Supervisor	0%	4.54%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.76%	5.00%	0%

*Note: Turnover rates are calculated using filled positions at the end of the month and includes only those employees who left state government during that month. It does not include employees who transferred from one program or Division to another within DHHS or from DHHS to another state agency. Turnover is as of the last day of posted month.

Aggregate Counts – Aug 2015			
Title	Total Employees	Term Employees	Turnover
FPS Trainee	23	1	4.34%%
FPS	114	2	1.75%
FP Supervisor	26	0	0%

YRTC Staff Turnover

Strengths/Opportunities:

Aug 2015: Decrease in turnover percent for Youth Security Specialist I and increase for Youth Security Specialist II

Barriers:

Action Items:

OUTCOME STATEMENT: The Division of Children and Family Services' Workforce is well-qualified, trained, Supervised and Supported

YRTC Turnover Percent*

Title	Aug 2014	Sep 2014	Oct 2014	Nov 2014	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	June 2015	July 2015	Aug 2015
YOUTH SECURITY SPECIALIST I	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.85%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.10%	5.05%
YOUTH SECURITY SPECIALIST II	1.53%	4.74%	4.89%	3.31%	0.00%	1.54%	3.19%	3.29%	0.00%	6.93%	1.67%	0.00%	5.02%

Turnover Percent Aug 2015

Title	Geneva	Kearney
YOUTH SECURITY SPECIALIST I	0.00%	7.69%
YOUTH SECURITY SPECIALIST II	0.00%	8.11%

Turnover Counts Aug 2015

Title	Geneva	Kearney
YOUTH SECURITY SPECIALIST I	0	1
YOUTH SECURITY SPECIALIST II	0	3

Aggregate Counts

Title	Total Employee	Term Employee	Turnover
YOUTH SECURITY SPECIALIST I	19.8	1	5.05%
YOUTH SECURITY SPECIALIST II	59.75	3	5.02%

*Note: Turnover rates are calculated using filled positions at the end of the month and includes only those employees who left [DHHS employment](#) during that month. It does not include employees who transferred from one program or Division to another within DHHS. Turnover is as of the last day of posted month.

CHAPTERS 6 – 9

Data will be available in the near future.

CHAPTER 6:	Service Array
CHAPTER 7:	Coordination/ Collaboration and Communication
CHAPTER 8:	Financing
CHAPTER 9:	Indian Child Welfare (ICWA)

CHAPTER 6: SERVICE ARRAY

- **OUTCOME STATEMENT:** CHILDREN AND FAMILIES HAVE ACCESS TO QUALITY SERVICES
- **Goal Statement:** NE's service array will assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe home environment, enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and help children in foster care and adoptive placements achieve permanency (Federal Systemic Factor-Service Array).

CHAPTER 7: COORDINATION/COLLABORATION/COMMUNICATION

- **OUTCOME STATEMENT:** THE CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM WILL BE STRENGTHENED THROUGH THE COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS OF MANY
- **Goal Statement:** When implanting the provisions of the CFSP, DCFS will engage and have ongoing consultation with tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, juvenile court, and other public and private child and family serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals and objectives of the CFSP (Federal Systemic Factor – Agency Responsiveness to the Community).

CHAPTER 8: FINANCING

- **OUTCOME STATEMENT:** MAXIMIZE FEDERAL TITLE IV-E FUNDING FOR FEDERALLY ALLOWABLE SERVICES FOR IV-E ELIGIBLE YOUTH.
- **Goal Statement:** Prospectively address unresolved Title IV-E claiming concerns previously identified through audit findings and department deferral or disallowance Correspondence.

CHAPTER 9: INDIAN CHILD WELFARE

- **OUTCOME STATEMENT:** THE CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM WILL BE STRENGTHEND THROUGH THE COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS OF MANY
- **Goal Statement:** When implanting the provisions of the CFSP, DCFS will engage and have ongoing consultation with tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster Care, providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals and objectives of the CFSP (Federal Systemic Factor-Agency Responsiveness to the Community).

CHAPTER 10: ORGANIZATIONAL EXCELLENCE

OUTCOME STATEMENT: DCFS IS A SELF-DIAGNOSING AND SELF-CORRECTING SYSTEM

Goal Statement: Quantitative and qualitative data measures will be used to evaluate and improve performance, guide decision-making, enhance transparency and strengthen accountability


Schedule of Discussion Subjects 2015

- January 29
 - Process Measures
 - Federal Results (COMPASS)
 - SDM Fidelity (Risk, FSNA & Well-Being)
 - CFSR Path to Progress (4,6,12,15 & 21)
- February 26
 - SDM Fidelity (Risk-Re, Reunification)
 - CFSR Path to Progress (13,16, 21)
 - Case Plan Goal Discussion – (7,8,9 & 10)
 - Case Plan Quality
 - ESA Local CQI Update
 - Removal Contacts w/in 30 days (8)
- March 26
 - Process Measures
 - SDM Fidelity (Overrides)
 - CFSR Path to Progress (17a,17b, follow up action items)
 - CFSR Round 2 to 3 Discussion
 - Timeliness of case plan completion
 - WSA Local CQI Update
- April 23
 - Process Measures
 - SDM Fidelity
 - CFSR Path to Progress (22 & 23)
 - Recurrence of Maltreatment Discussion – (2)
 - SESA Local CQI Update
 - Person Characteristics N-Focus Enhancement
- May 28
 - Process Measures
 - CFSR Path to Progress
 - Placement Stability Discussion – (6)
 - CSA Local CQI Update
 - Removal Contacts w/in 30 days (8)
- June 25
 - Operations Plan
 - CFSR Path to Progress
 - Round 3 Federal Indicators Update
 - Out-of-State Youth Analysis
 - Maltreatment in Foster Care Recurrence Discussion
 - NSA Local CQI Update
- July 23 -
 - Process Measures
 - Timeliness of Permanency Discussion
 - Operations Data
 - Re-entry Discussion (3)
 - ESA Local CQI Update
- August 27
 - Process Measures
 - SDM Fidelity
 - Re-entry Discussion
 - Removal Contacts w/in 30 days (8)
 - WSA Local CQI Update
- September 24
 - Process Measures
 - LB-1160 Survey results
 - SESA Local CQI Update
- October 29
 - Process Measures
 - Operations Data
 - Intake / SDM Fidelity
 - Federal Results (COMPASS)
 - CESA Local CQI Update
- November 19
 - Process Measures
 - Intake / SDM Fidelity
 - SDM Fidelity
 - NSA Local CQI Update
- December
 - No Meeting this month


Federal IM 12-07

- **CQI Structure**
 - Statewide Quality Assurance program with autonomous oversight and dedicated staff
 - Continual training of CQI staff is occurring and QA is collaboratively working with Policy, Training and Administrators to ensure QA's decisions are based upon common policy and to help policy with Administrator's situations
 - Written policies and procedures are being updated and produced where they don't exist
- **Quality Data Collection**
 - Common data collection and measuring process statewide
 - All QA staff are trained and utilize the same QA Tools
 - CFSR reviews are performed by the same staff and reported consistently
 - 2nd level reviews occur on all processes to ensure consistent QA and learning opportunities
- **Case Record Review Data and Process**
 - Quality unit is responsible for all case reviews
 - Case review system has been developed to randomly select cases statewide, provide the QA person with correct review questions and stores results in a non-editable location.
 - Case review system has been modified to allow for testing of specific CFSR questions by service area as needed and generate an email to the worker.
 - Inter-rater reliability testing is ongoing to ensure consistent scoring.
- **Analysis and Dissemination of Quality Data**
 - Statewide case review system has been developed to review all cases selected for review
 - Data is reported statewide and by service area
 - An extensive array of performance reports are created and distributed at monthly CQI meeting
- **Feedback to Stakeholders**
 - Results are used to inform training, policy, stakeholders, community partnerships and others as a means to identify and communicate improvement opportunities and areas of strength
 - Supervisors and field staff understand how results link to daily casework practices; results are used by supervisors and field leadership to assess and improve practice.
 - First stage of CQI communications is monthly Statewide CQI meeting. Second stage of CQI communications is local CQI meetings. At the local level 4-6 areas of improvement have been selected and structured teams created to analyze the results and identify improvement opportunities.

Statewide CQI Process



Local CQI Process



Inter Reliability Program

Strengths/Opportunities:

* The P&S QA team transitioned to completing reliability reviews using the new federal CFSR tool in January 2015.

Barriers:

Action Items:


* Additional reviewer training on the following areas have been planned to ensure increase in reviewer proficiency using the new CFSR review tool.

- Critical Thinking and Parent Applicability following the new Round 3 Definitions.
- Reviewer Guide and Working in Teams.

* Additional reliability exercises, on line quizzes and activities to improve reliability are planned each month.

Data Review Frequency: Monthly

Outcome: Improve the Inter Rater Reliability of the Program Accuracy Specialists (PAS)



The Chart Illustrates the 4 most recent PAS CFSR reliability scores. Reliability scores prior to the implementation of the NEW Round 3 CFSR tool are not included due to the change in review tools. The QA team began using the Round 3 CFSR Tool in January 2015.

Information System

Strengths/Opportunities:

* Data indicates areas needing improvement in the child and medical conditions and parental rights fields on N-FOCUS.

Barriers:

Action Items:

*Refer to Local Service Area or Tribal Action Plan Forms for detailed Action Items and Strategies for each Area/Tribe.

Outcome: The statewide information system is functioning as expected and state can readily and accurately identify the status, demographic characteristics, location and goals of the placement for every child who is in foster care?




Systemic Factor #19: Statewide Information System

How well is the statewide information system functioning statewide to ensure that at a minimum, the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics,

PUR: Jan 2014 - Jan 2015
PUR: Mar 2014 - Mar 2015
PUR: Jun 2014 - Jun 2015

Target = 100%



Source of Data: N-FOCUS documentation and interview with the case manager.

PUR Jan 2014-Jan 2015: Reviewers were able to speak to the current case manager for 95% or 236 out of 249 of the cases that were reviewed.

PUR Mar 2014 - Mar 2015: Reviewers were able to speak to the current case manager for 95% or 196 out of 208 of the cases that were reviewed.

PUR Jun 2014 - Jun 2015: Reviewers were able to speak to the current case manager for 93% or 196 out of 210 of the cases that were reviewed.




Systemic Factor #19: Statewide Information System

How well is the statewide information system functioning statewide to ensure that at a minimum, the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for children in foster care?

PUR: Jun 2014 - Jun 2015
n=210

Target = 100%



Source of Data: N-FOCUS documentation and interview with the case manager (Child & Medical Conditions were added to the QA review in Aug 2015).

PUR Jun 2014 - Jun 2015: Reviewers were able to speak to the current case manager for 93% or 196 out of 210 of the cases that were reviewed.



Prepared by:

Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services
Children and Family Services
Research, Planning and Evaluation Unit
402-471-0729

DHHS.CQI@nebraska.gov

